

REMARKS

1. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-25, 27-35, 37-43, and 45-51 under 35 U. S. C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Dickson et al. (6,445, 983).

More specifically, the Examiner has indicated that Dickson et al. discloses the invention as claimed.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, 22, 24, 27, 28, 32, 34, 37, 38, 39, 42, 45, 46, 47, and 50 are amended.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees in regard to claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, 22, 24, 27, 28, 32, 34, 37, 38, 39, 42, 45, 46, 47, and 50 as explicitly amended, and in regard to claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 40, 41, 43, 44, 48, 49, 51, and 52 as originally filed, but implicitly amended by being dependent on explicitly amended claims.

Under 35 U.S.C. Section 102, a party asserting that a patent claim is anticipated must demonstrate, among other things, identity of invention. One who seeks such a finding must show that each element of the claim in issue is found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single

prior art reference. Thus, in order for Dickson to anticipate claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-25, 27-35, 37-43, and 45-51 as amended there must be identity of invention between the Dickson patent and claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-25, 27-35, 37-43, and 45-51 as amended, and further that all the elements of claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-25, 27-35, 37-43, and 45-51 as amended must be found in Dickson. It is believed, however, that the present invention as it is described according to claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-25, 27-35, 37-43, and 45-51 as amended, is different from Dickson.

Indeed, there are structural differences between the Dickson invention and the present invention as it is claimed by the amended claim 1. Indeed, the Dickson device discloses an automatic guidance system including at least two sensors (Col 10, lines 15-17, 34-36), and a program configured to select a mode of operation from at least two modes of operation. (Col. 10, lines 20-29, 40-46). Dickson device is an automatic guidance system having a multi-sensor data fusion means to select the best possible sensor (out of at least two sensors) for real time vehicle guidance.

On the other hand, the present invention according to amended claim 1 teaches:

A method of steering a vehicle along a predetermined 2-D path on a 2-D plane by using a steering control algorithm, said vehicle including a single navigation system and including a navigation antenna, said navigation antenna being mounted on said vehicle at an optimum antenna position, said steering control algorithm assuming a nominal antenna position at a predetermined reference point; said method comprising

the steps of:

(A) obtaining a set of positioning data of said vehicle by using said single navigation system and by using said navigation antenna mounted at said optimum antenna position;

(B) pre-adjusting said set of positioning data obtained in said step (A) and feeding said pre-adjusted set of positioning data into said steering control algorithm;

(C) measuring a steering angle of the front wheels of said vehicle relative to a predetermined reference direction on said 2-D plane;

(D) calculating a correction to said measured steering angle on said 2-D plane;

and

(E) performing a steering action by using said correction to said measured steering angle on said 2-D plane in order to move said vehicle along said predetermined 2-D path on said 2-D plane.

Thus, the method of present invention teaches how to optimize the use of *a single navigation system* by pre-adjusting the set of positioning data obtained by the single navigation system and how to feed this data into the steering control algorithm that performs the steering action.

Thus, it is believed that there is no identity of invention between the Dickson patent and claim 1 as amended of the present invention.

To anticipate under 35 U.S.C. Section 102, in addition to the identity of elements, these same elements must function in substantially the same way to produce substantially the same result. The identity of function and result required in the above test refers not to the identity of the function of each

element in the prior art as compared to the function of the corresponding element of the invention, but to the function and the result produced by the combination of all elements in the invention as compared to the function and result of the combination of the allegedly identical elements in the prior art reference.

Applying the above test of anticipation to claim 1 as amended and Dickson device, it is believed that the present invention disclosed in claim 1 as amended functions and produces results very differently from Dickson device.

Indeed, the function of the present invention according to claim 1 as amended is:

To pre-adjust a set of positioning data obtained by a single navigation system including a navigation antenna for the difference between an actual antenna position and a nominal antenna position at a predetermined reference point; and to feed the pre-adjusted set of positioning data into the steering control algorithm to perform the steering action.

The result of the present invention according to claim 1 as amended is:

A method of steering a vehicle along a predetermined 2-D path on a 2-D plane by using a steering control algorithm, whereas a set of positioning data obtained by a single navigation system including a navigation antenna is pre-adjusted to take into account the difference between an actual antenna position and a nominal antenna position at a predetermined reference point, whereas the pre-adjusted set of positioning

data is fed into the steering control algorithm.

On the other hand, the function and the result of the Dickson device according to its preferred embodiment is:

How to optimize the automatic guidance of an agricultural vehicle with multiple sensors by performing the multi-sensor fusion to select the best possible navigation data.

It is believed that according to the above test for anticipation the present invention described in claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by the Dickson device.

The similar reasoning applies also to claims 2-52 of the present invention.

Therefore, it is believed that there is no identity of invention between the present invention as it is claimed by claims 1-52 as amended and the Dickson patent.

Claims 1-52 as amended of the present invention are also believed to be unobvious over Dickson under the Graham test.

To satisfy the Graham test it is sufficient to ascertain the differences in function and the differences in result between the claims in issue and the prior

art. For the same reasons as it was discussed above there are significant differences in function and significant differences in result between the present invention according to claims 1-52 as amended and Dickson invention. It follows, that there is no suggestion in Dickson patent of the present invention as it is claimed in claims 1-52 as amended. Therefore, the present invention is not obvious in view of Dickson.

2. The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 16, 26, 36, 44, and 52 under 35 U. S. C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Dickson et al. and further in view of Fujioka et al. (6,886,656).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Indeed, it was shown above, that claims 1-52 as amended of the present invention are not unobvious over Dickson under the Graham test.

It follows, that claims 1-52 as amended of the present invention are not unobvious over Dickson in view of Fujioka under the Graham test because the hypothetical invention Dickson in view of Fujioka is a more narrow invention than the Dickson invention standing alone. Thus, it is believed that claims 1-52 as amended of the present invention are not unobvious over Dickson in view of Fujioka under the Graham test.

3. Now claims 1-52 are pending in the present application and are

believed to be in condition of allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully solicited.

February 17, 2006

Respectfully Submitted by


Boris Tankhilevich

Patent attorney for the applicant

Reg. No. 38,689.